

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

21 Pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 5, the court  
22 certifies the following question to the Nevada Supreme Court:

## 23 I. Question of Law

24       Whether, under Nevada law, an additional insured endorsement  
25 provides coverage for an injury caused by the sole independent  
26 negligence of the additional insured?

27 || II. Statement of Proposed Facts

28 On October 1, 2001, American Hardware Mutual Insurance

1 Company ("American Hardware") issued an insurance policy to Clark  
2 Lift West, Inc. ("Clark Lift") of Sacramento, California. The  
3 insurance policy was in full force and effect on October 12, 2001.  
4 As part of the policy, American Hardware issued an Additional  
5 Insured Endorsement which named Southern Wine & Spirits of America,  
6 Inc. as an additional insured.

7 On January 16, 2004, Charles K. Pierce filed a personal injury  
8 lawsuit in state court, naming Southern Wine & Spirits of America,  
9 Inc. ("Southern Wine"), as one of the defendants. At the time of  
10 his injury, Mr. Pierce was acting within the course and scope of  
11 his employment. He was performing repair work on a conveyor motor  
12 belt system on the premises of Southern Wine.

13 Southern Wine and its liability carrier, Federal Insurance  
14 Company, tendered the defense to American Hardware, and American  
15 Hardware denied coverage. The parties have a dispute concerning  
16 whether Southern Wine is covered under the American Hardware  
17 Insurance policy for Mr. Pierce's accident.

18 **III. Names of Plaintiffs and Defendant**

19 Plaintiffs: Federal Insurance Company; Southern Wine &  
20 Spirits of America Inc.

21 Defendant: American Hardware Mutual Insurance Company

22 **IV. Names and Addresses of Counsel**

23 Plaintiffs: Thierry V. Barkley, Esq.  
24 Thorndal, Armstrong, Delk, Balkenbush, Eisinger  
6590 S. McCarron Blvd, Ste. B  
Reno, Nevada 89509

25 Defendant: Robert L. Eisenberg, Esq.  
26 Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg  
6005 Plumas Street, Suite 300  
Reno, Nevada 89509

27

28

1 **V. Other Relevant Matters**

2 The United States District Court for the District of Nevada  
3 requests that the Nevada Supreme Court answer this certified  
4 question in accordance with Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 5.  
5 The question appears to be determinative of the case pending before  
6 this court and there appears to be no definitive controlling  
7 precedent in the published opinions of the Nevada Supreme Court.

8 It is so ordered.

9 DATED: This 10th day of November, 2005.

10   
11

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28